As an 8 year employee of T-Mobile and a 21 year veteran of the wireless industry I am unequivocally OPPOSED to this acquisition. Not only for the obvious reason that I WILL LIKELY BE JOINING the masses of the unemployed but this WILL NOT be good for any US Consumer.
AT&T states layoffs will be avoided through natural attrition. I can tell you as an INSIDER. Layoffs have already begun.Being in sales the bar has risen. My quota doubled a month after the announcement. Fact of the matter is I will be let go long before the deal is consummated as I will have missed my now 100% higher quota and will have been let go already. There is your natural attrition for you. Our organization has fallen into a catatonic state. My fellow employees are in fear an most loathe AT&T as they are known for NOT BEING a good place to work employer as T-Mobile has been and being in sales my Business clients loathe the idea of their business being moved to AT&T.
In general I am also in FULL agreement with the comments below:AT&T's purchase of T-Mobile, AT&T and Verizon would have approximately 80 percent of U.S. wireless subscribers. AT&T claims smaller competitors such as Cricket, MetroPCS and Cellular South are threatening AT&T's business. But MetroPCS, with 8 million subscribers, would be less than 1/16 of the new AT&T's size.

The merger will result in less innovation. AT&T is right that T-Mobile can't find enough spectrum for a nationwide 4G LTE network. T-Mobile is innovating around the problem, with a path to raise its HSPA+ network to LTE-class speeds. For now, T-Mobile's frugal strategies may provide a laboratory for solutions to the overall spectrum crisis, and the company may acquire more spectrum in the future.
AT&T argues that T-Mobile's lack of spectrum makes it a non-viable carrier, but many of the smaller competitors that AT&T finds so threatening (such as MetroPCS) have even less spectrum nationwide. AT&T can't have it both ways.
The merger will result in a monopoly on GSM service. GSM, along with its close relatives UMTS and HSPA, is the world's global technology, with 750 networks in 219 countries supplying service to approximately 3.9 billion subscriptions, according to the GSM Association. The smaller CDMA system used by the other U.S. carriers has approximately 439 million subscriptions. Many devices are available primarily or only on the GSM radio system.
AT&T and T-Mobile are the only two of the top seven U.S. carriers to implement GSM, aligning them with the rest of the world. Merging the two carriers would create only one U.S. customer for the global flow of GSM equipment, marginalizing us in the global marketplace and making all of the combined carrier's phones U.S. exclusives, unable to be switched to any other large carrier.
AT&T's argument about needing spectrum is disingenuous. Wireless carriers will all eventually need more spectrum. The real question is, is AT&T's spectrum position weak compared to its competitors? A recent CNET article by Marguerite Reardon shows the answer to be no. AT&T, which was one of the two big winners in the 2008 700MHz spectrum auction and is currently trying to buy more from Qualcomm, is "sitting on more spectrum than any other wireless operator in the top 21 markets in the U.S., and about a third of that spectrum is still being unused," Reardon reports. AT&T's well-known capacity problems may not be because of a lack of spectrum, but because of a lack of planning,

capital spending, and investments in backhaul?none of which require a purchase of T-Mobile to help. Holding LTE deployment hostage to a merger is reprehensible. Most of the comments in support of this merger are from groups supporting AT&T's decision to extend LTE service to 95 percent of the USA. But AT&T can already implement nationwide LTE service over time, using its existing 700MHz, 850MHz and 1900MHz spectrum, and could innovate in other deals such as partnerships with smaller rural spectrum holders. Holding minority, rural, and other communities hostage to a merger deal is the worst kind of bargaining.

If the FCC does approve this merger, in my view the only way to maintain wireless competition in the U.S. would be to adopt a "common carrier" rule for the new AT&T network. AT&T must be required to offer wholesale voice and 4G data service, at attractive and regulated rates, to any virtual network operator that wants to compete.

Of course, we've seen this strategy fail before. We have the developed world's least competitive home Internet access market in part because the Supreme Court in 2004 voided rules forcing competition there, resulting in most Americans having only one or two choices for home Internet access.

The U.S. is currently a leader in wireless innovation. Let's not allow the wireless market to become similar to the home Internet access market, where our networks are considered slow, expensive and uncompetitive on a global scale. This merger would be a step in that negative direction.